has greater access to capital markets at a national level giving it greater liquidity and thus a lower cost of equity.

Q. Item #8 on Attachment #3 discusses changing the default factor for Network Operations Expense. Would you discuss why you are proposing a change in this item.

A. Yes. Network Operations Expense encompasses the following accounts in the Uniform System of Accounts:

| | |
|---|---|
| Network Operations Expense | 6530 |
| Power Expense | 6531 |
| Network Administration Expense | 6532 |
| Testing Expense | 6533 |
| Plant Operations Administration Expense | 6534 |
| Engineering Expense | 6535 |

Expenditures in these areas for small companies differ significantly from larger companies. For example, the plant administration expense account includes the cost of overall supervision of plant operations, including overall planning, developing methods and procedures, developing plant training and coordinating safety programs. The account excludes immediate or first level supervision which is included in the plant specific accounts. In most small companies, the second level of supervision is the company manager, consequently, most small companies have very little plant administration expense. Engineering expense is generally less in small companies since most engineering is on a specific project basis rather than of a general nature. Network administration activities in small companies do not include extensive network control facilities because their networks are limited.

In the HAI Model, Network Operations Expense is generated based on a composite level of expenses for the ARMIS reporting companies on a per line basis. The model then multiplies this expense level by the Network Operations Expense factor to arrive at a final estimate of Network Operations Expense. The HAI modelers in the default assumptions have assigned this factor a 50% value, essentially indicating that forward- looking Network Operations Expenses would/should be half of the current level. Their rationale for doing this is summarized as follows:

> "....these costs are artificially high because they reflect antiquated systems and practices that are more costly than the modern equipment and practices that the HAI Model assumes will be installed on a forward-looking basis. Furthermore, today's costs do not reflect much of the substantial savings opportunities posed by new technologies, such as new management network standards, intranets, and the like."

Because small companies have very different circumstances and do not have many of the systems typical in large companies, it is our belief that the types of forward-looking savings the modelers are anticipating for large companies will not, nor cannot, be achieved in small companies. We are, therefore, proposing that the Network Operations Expense factor be set at 100% rather than 50%. Use of this factor produces modeled Network Operations Expenses that are somewhat less than, but relatively close, to the expenses currently encountered by the small Illinois Companies.

Q. Please describe the changes you made in local number portability cost as described in Item #9, Attachment #3.

A. The default inputs assume a cost of $0.25 per line per month to recover the cost of implementing local number portability. Since none of the small Illinois companies have implemented this function, we have reduced this input to zero. This reduces the calculated USF cost by a similar amount per line.

Q. Item #10, Attachment #3, describes changes in the Billing and Bill Inquiry input. Would you please describe this input in great detail and your rationale for changing it.

A. Yes. This input is intended to capture the customer operations costs of providing local service billing, collecting, bill inquiry and other inquiries regarding the provision of service. The provision of these services differ in a number of respects between large and small companies. Many of the customer contact functions for large companies are performed in centralized centers by relatively large work groups. With these work group sizes, there may be opportunities to adjust the work group to fluctuating workloads on an hourly or daily basis. Billing functions are typically spread throughout the month with multiple billing cycles. Typically, the data processing and bill processing functions are performed with in-house computer assets and in-house personnel.

In small companies, these functions are generally performed by only a few individuals with staffing required during the normal business hours to provide service availability to customers. There are relatively few opportunities to adjust work group levels to variations in the customer contact workload. Billing is typically performed once a month so there are greater variations in the work flow

than in larger companies. Oftentimes, service bureaus are used by small telephone companies, at a minimum, to provide software support and often provides full bill processing functions using investments made by the service bureau. Thus, the expense and investment levels of small companies may vary significantly from larger companies.

In order to test the validity of the default assumption, GVNW undertook a study of the customer service expenses of a number of its cost study clients to separate the costs associated with local services and billing from those associated with toll and carrier billing functions. Using cost study information from separations studies, which separate such expenses into a number of different categories by work functions, GVNW developed an average cost per line for those companies of the local billing functions. The results of that study indicated a $3.62 cost per line for the local billing and customer contact functions. We believe this result is more representative of the cost of these functions in small Illinois companies and have thus incorporated this estimate in the economic cost studies we have performed.

Q. Item #11, in Attachment #3, relates to carrier-to-carrier billing costs. What is your rationale for changing the default level for this item?

A. Carrier-to-carrier billing costs include the ongoing cost of responding to IXO service change requests and the cost of rendering Carrier Access Billing System ("CABS") bills to individual carriers for their use of the local exchange network in providing toll services. These bills are rendered at an individual wire center level to each interexchange carrier, mostly on a monthly basis. With average wire

center sizes for the small companies at a significantly smaller level than the average for large Bell Operating Companies, it is not surprising that the cost of this function is different for small companies.

The default input for this item is $1.69 per line per year. A study of these costs using data available from a group of the Illinois cost companies' cost separations studies indicated that, on average, these costs are $16.83 per line per year. This value has been used as the input for this cost item. Within the model, this value only impacts the costs of the access elements and does not affect the local service cost.

Q. Item #12, Attachment #3, describes changes in the model inputs for central office switching and transmission expense. Please describe the derivation of the default input values and the values that the IITA has used in its development of forward-looking costs.

A. In developing expenses for most of the plant specific expense categories, the HAI Model uses recent ARMIS data from around the country to develop ratios between current expenses and investments as a basis for developing projected forward-looking expense levels. However, in the case of central office switching and transmission expense, this data is overridden by two alternative expense ratios, one for each investment category. The input levels for these items are based on a 1993 incremental cost study performed by New England Telephone

Company in New Hampshire and are considerably lower than current levels experienced even by the Bell Operating Companies.

The IITA inputs are developed based on current ratios of expenses to investment for these expense/investment categories for the small Illinois telephone companies. Since the type of investment included in these accounts is generally reflective of forward-looking technology, it is reasonable to expect that the ratios currently experienced by the Illinois companies are reflective of the forward-looking costs they can expect to experience.

**ECONOMIC COST STUDY RESULTS**

Q. Using the input changes you have described plus the default inputs for the remaining items, have you completed "economic cost" studies using the HAI 5.0a Model for each of the small companies in Illinois?

A. Such studies have been completed under my direction. The results of these studies are summarized in IITA Exhibit #1, Attachment #5. Attachment #5 shows that the monthly USF cost per line varies from a level of $47.76 to $273.89 for the individual companies. The weighted average of these costs across all the companies (using actual company access lines) is $91.67. The weighted average cost is the proxy cost, as that term is used in the statute for the total group of companies.

**AFFORDABLE RATE**

Q. Have you developed a proposed "affordable rate" for each of the companies?

A. Yes, that has also been developed under my direction. Since the time for preparation and prosecution of this case is limited and because the proposal for IUSF funding is ultimately limited by the individual companies' earnings levels on an embedded cost basis, the IITA is proposing that the "affordable rate" be established at the minimum level allowed by the statute--the current rates that are in effect. This will provide a rate within the limits of the statute but will avoid the necessity for a prolonged discussion of alternative methods of determining an "affordable rate". The IITA's proposal is specifically that the affordable rate be established at the current rate level for basic service (including any state carrier common line surcharge rates and EAS rate elements) for the class of service being considered plus any additive rates for touch calling service. To simplify the calculation in my Attachments, the level displayed is the weighted average rate for residential and business service.

Q. The statute requires that before a company may receive support from an IUSF, the company must demonstrate that the economic cost is greater than the affordable rate. Have you demonstrated this for each of the companies?

A. Yes, in two different ways. First, in this case, the individually calculated proxy cost for each company exceeds the proposed affordable rate for that company. In addition, the weighted average proxy cost for the combined companies is greater than the weighted average affordable rate for the combined companies, thus demonstrating that the statutory test has been met.

## DETERMINING LEVEL OF SUPPORT

Q. The statute requires in determining the level of support to be received that federal support funds received by the companies must be taken into account. Have you performed this analysis?

A. Yes, IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment #5, displays the calculation of support amounts using the economic costs that have been developed, the proposed affordable rate and the federal support fund received by the companies.

Q. Could you explain Attachment #5 in greater detail.

A. Yes. Using the actual company access lines and the difference between the economic cost and affordable rate developed in Attachment #5, I have calculated the total potential annual support amount. I have then subtracted from that the federal support funds received by the company to arrive at the IUSF eligibility amount based on an individual company cost determination.

Q. Please describe in greater detail the amounts included as federal support funds?

A. These amounts are calculated from three different sources. First, at the federal jurisdiction, 25% of local loop costs are assigned to the carrier common line (CCL) revenue requirement for cost settlement companies with an equivalent amount being assigned for average schedule settlement companies. Funding for this CCL revenue requirement comes at the federal level from several different sources. These include the federal end user common line charge, or EUCL, carrier common line charges billed to interexchange carriers, the long-term support portion of the federal USF, and net settlements with the National

Exchange Carrier Association's CCL pool (either positive or negative) to equal the CCL revenue requirement. The amounts included for the CCL revenue requirement are the latest estimates of 2000 actual amounts. Second, many companies receive federal high cost loop support from the federal USF. These amounts have been included as federal support amounts by annualizing the Fourth Quarter, 2000 amounts posted by the Universal Service Administration Company ("USAC") on their web page. Third, all the small Illinois companies receive federal local switching support from the federal USF. These amounts have also been included by annualizing Fourth Quarter, 2000 estimated amounts posted by USAC on their web page.

Q. Can you summarize the results of Attachment #5?

A. Yes, on an individual company basis, all but four of the companies show some level of need for state USF funding. Using the statutory proxy cost criteria, in summary, the analysis shows a potential IUSF funding support requirement of over $73 million for the Illinois small companies as a group. This demonstrates that the "economic cost" substantially exceeds the proposed affordable rate and the federal support for the companies as a whole. It further demonstrates that using the proxy cost approach as contained in the statute, the small Illinois companies, as a group, would be eligible for receiving that amount of IUSF funding and that each company should be eligible for such funding.

Q. Is the IITA proposing that this full funding eligibility be implemented in 2001 or in the future?

A. No, it is not. The results of developing the economic cost for the companies, using the forward-looking model and making the other adjustments as required by the statute, produces a result which is well beyond the needs of the small Illinois companies in total. These results emphasize the potential discontinuity between forward-looking costs and the actual embedded costs of the companies. In addition, as discussed earlier in my testimony, results of this analysis, when compared with the analysis that will be presented hereafter, shows the discontinuity that can result for individual companies because of the infirmities of the forward-looking models and techniques.

As discussed subsequently in my testimony, the rate-of-return showing required by the Commission will determine the size of the fund, the companies qualifying for IUSF support and the amount of the support on an individual company basis. That limitation makes the HAI results virtually meaningless but for the "economic cost" requirements of the statute for the Illinois small companies as a group. In any event, the Commission, the Hearing Examiner and all parties should understand that the IITA is not advocating the creation of an IUSF in the amount set forth on Attachment #5.

Q. What additional steps is the IITA proposing should be taken in determining the funding to be provided by the IUSF?

A. In its November 21, 2000 Order in these dockets, the Commission expressed its intent that IUSF funds should not be provided to companies until some type of showing is made that the company is "in need" of receiving such funding. The

clear intent of the Order was to include an evaluation of a company's current earnings position, without IUSF funding, to see whether the company needs such funding to maintain an appropriate earnings level. While such a requirement is clearly not included within the statutes dealing with the IUSF, the IITA understands that such a test will be conducted to determine the level of IUSF funding a company can receive. This is being done to comply with the Commission's expressed desires and to provide the information the Commission has indicated it needs in order to implement an IUSF.

Q. How will this be done?

A. The IITA and the Staff have held extensive discussions to develop a simplified process for conducting such an analysis within the time constraints of this proceeding. As a result of these discussions, the IITA and the Staff are near agreement on a simplified filing process and form based primarily on data available from a company's annual financial report that will demonstrate the funding need a company may have for IUSF funding to maintain a reasonable rate-of-return. The IITA and Staff have also arrived at an agreed upon rate-of-return for the small companies to use for this determination.

Q. Can you describe the general process being discussed by the Staff and the IITA.

A. Yes. The process and form that have been agreed to is the development of an individual company revenue requirement based on a simplified procedure which is contained in the form developed by the two parties. Generally, it is based on actual total company 2000 financial results as reported to the Commission on

Form 23A or other suitable annual financial reports acceptable to the Commission. Included in the form are the opportunity to make certain adjustments to the results to reflect known changes to the financial results. The form also includes an adjustment to remove the support amounts received during 2000 from the IUSF and from the DEM Weighting Fund. The form compares the company's embedded cost revenue requirement with the return level agreed to between the Staff and the IITA and calculates the funding needed from the IUSF in the future to achieve this reasonable return. That amount would be the amount of IUSF funding that the company would be entitled to under the new IUSF fund.

Q. You indicated that there is an agreement between the Staff and the IITA regarding the return on rate base level that should be used in making this calculation. Can you describe that agreement.

A. Yes. The IITA and Staff discussed the major elements that go into determining a rate-of-return on rate base. Because of the limited time to complete this proceeding before the DEM Weighting Fund expires, the two parties agreed that it would be prudent to arrive at a rate-of-return that could be used for all the companies based on general financial parameters rather than detailed studies of each company's specific circumstances. After a number of discussions, the two parties agreed upon a set of factors that would be used to determine the rate-of-return. These included a hypothetical capital structure of 40% debt and 60% equity, a current cost of long term debt of 9% based on current Rural Telephone Finance Corporation quoted lending levels, and a cost of equity of 15% and 13.8% for the non-Frontier small companies and Frontier companies respectively.

It was also agreed that since the form developed to evaluate the earnings did not include interest cost in the calculation of income taxes that an after tax cost of debt would be used in calculating the overall rate-of-return to be used in the earnings analysis form.

Q. How do you see this analysis being presented in determining the IUSF funds that should be provided to the small companies under the new IUSF?

A. It is my understanding that each of the companies that desire to receive funding from the new IUSF would need to complete the earnings evaluation form and demonstrate that on an embedded cost basis their earnings, absent the receipt of the current IUSF and DEM Weighting Funds they receive, would be less than the agreed upon overall rate-of-return. Such companies would be eligible to receive IUSF from the new fund sufficient to bring them to the agreed upon earnings level.

Q. Are you presenting evidence regarding the companies who will be requesting IUSF from the new fund and the overall amount of the fund?

A. Not at this time. The agreed upon procedure is based upon the annual financial report to the Commission. In order to provide the latest available data, the parties have agreed to a procedural schedule, which would have this data filed on April 20, 2001, shortly after many companies file Form 23A with the Commission. The earnings analysis can thus be based on year 2000 data. Individual companies eligible for and desiring to request funds from the new IUSF will be submitting

the appropriate data in an April 20, 2001 filing in these dockets. I will be providing a summary of the requested amounts at that time.

Q. I presume then that you cannot provide any hard data at this time on the size of the new IUSF fund. Do you have an idea regarding the potential size of the fund?

A. While you are correct that I do not have hard data at this point in time, some preliminary analysis was done using 1999 data and an earnings evaluation process similar to that agreed upon with the Staff. Based on that analysis, I expect that while many companies will be requesting IUSF funding, others will probably not. Furthermore, based on that analysis, I would anticipate that the requested funding will be less than the current IUSF funding levels.

Q. Are there actions during the duration of these dockets that could change this analysis?

A. The primary thing I can think of would be a significant change in the companies' access rates as a result of the current policy of mirroring federal rates combined with some significant change in federal access policies. Currently, the FCC has under consideration two major proposals that could cause significant changes in federal access rates. Both the RTF Recommendation and the Multi-Association Group ("MAG") proposals before the FCC contain provisions for reducing federal access charges with an offset to the lost access revenues from increases in federal universal service funds. Should either of these proposals be adopted with a resulting significant reduction in federal access charges and with intrastate access rates reduced pursuant to the current mirroring policy, companies' earnings levels

could be significantly impacted. While I do not anticipate this occurring before the April 20, 2001 filing date, there is a good possibility that the FCC's review of the RTF Recommendation will be completed while these dockets are in progress.

Q. Is the IITA concerned about the potential impacts that such changes could have on the small Illinois telephone companies?

A. It certainly is. Consideration has been given and discussed with the parties on how best to address this issue in Illinois. There has been no agreement regarding the best way to do that, although several parties have expressed significant concerns about addressing it in these dockets. The IITA is not specifically addressing a proposed solution to this potential problem at this time and is continuing to consider how it should be addressed before the Commission. The IITA does, however, want to put both the Commission and the parties to this case on notice that if such a change in state access charges would result from changes in federal access rate policies, the resulting financial impacts, using the procedures discussed above to determine the IUSF funding in response to expressed policies of the Commission could directly impact the future size of the IUSF and/or require a different solution.

Q. Once the IUSF funding amounts are developed in this proceeding, does the IITA have recommendations as to how often these amounts should be reviewed?

A. Yes. We would recommend that, in general, they be reviewed relatively infrequently, such as on a three to five year timetable. This will limit the administrative and litigation costs that could be involved in a more frequent

update process. It would provide stability to the companies and an environment favorable to investment in new facilities since revenue streams would be stable over a mid-range time period. For the payers into the fund, it would provide relative stability in the amount of funding that would be required and would also limit the administrative and litigation costs associated with maintaining the fund.

Q. Are you proposing that the fund be frozen during this three to five year time period?

A. No. Since the funding is being limited to amounts necessary to achieve a reasonable rate-of-return, if industry policy changes at either the state or federal level cause changes in the companies' revenue streams, this proceeding should be reopened or a further proceeding should be held to evaluate future IUSF funding in light of the changed circumstances. A significant change in state access rates as a result of changes in federal or state access rate policies could trigger such a reevaluation, for example.

Individual companies may have changes in circumstances impacting their overall earnings during this time period that would provide an appropriate rationale for a company on an individual basis to seek a modification in USF funding. In light of the rate-of-return constraint being imposed in this proceeding, the companies so affected must have the right to make the necessary filings to have their change and circumstances addressed. I would contemplate that such a request would be conducted before the Commission in a manner that would allow all affected

parties to participate with regard to the determination of the companies' IUSF needs and the overall impact on the IUSF funding.

**IMPLICIT SUBSIDY REQUIREMENT**

Q. You indicated earlier that the statute contains a requirement for determining implicit subsidies, specifically, that any subsidies in interexchange carrier access rates should be identified before implementing an IUSF. How do you interpret this requirement?

A. I believe it means that the IITA must identify such subsidies, if any, that are contained in their interexchange carrier access rates. Such an identification can be made by comparing the current revenues with the "economic cost" of the interexchange carrier access rates. If the current revenues are equal to or less than the economic cost, there clearly would be no such implicit subsidy within those rates. If the current revenue is greater than the "economic cost", there would be concerns as to whether the rates do, in fact, contain a subsidy.

Q. Have you such an analysis to present?

A. Yes, I do. This analysis has been prepared using the same "economic cost" studies that were prepared to develop the economic cost of the supported universal services. As part of the HAI Model output file, there is a "cost detail" tab that includes calculations of IXC switched access rates. The analysis I will present has been developed using the end office switching, ISUP (SS7) signaling, dedicated transport and common transport elements developed in the HAI Model. These rates have been multiplied by actual 2000 intrastate access minutes to

develop the economic cost for access and compared to the intrastate access revenues received for those same minutes. The analysis is presented in IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment #6. On an individual company basis, the schedule indicates that a majority of the companies' access rates contain no subsidies. However, for a number of companies, the current revenues are greater than the "economic cost" developed for that company through the HAI model process. While this suggests concern that the rates might contain some subsidies, it does not, by any means, fully demonstrate that. Additional studies to show the stand alone cost of these services would be needed to fully identify whether there are subsidies in these rates. The IITA has not conducted such studies, and believes that they are unnecessary due to the proxy cost provisions of the statute. The Attachment shows that in summary, for all the companies, the economic cost of access, as developed by the HAI Model, are higher than the current access revenues for the companies as a whole. This demonstrates that there is no implicit subsidy, in total, in the access rates of the small Illinois ILECs, thus meeting the statutory test.

**FUNDING MECHANISM**

Q. What are the statutory requirements regarding the funding mechanism?

A. The statute requires that the funding for the IUSF be recovered from all interexchange carriers and local exchange carriers certificated by the Commission in a competitively neutral manner.

Q. Does the IITA have a proposed method for assessing the funds against these carriers?

A. No. The IITA is aware of the sharp debate that took place in Phase 1 of this proceeding between Ameritech and Verizon, on one hand, and AT&T and the other interexchange carriers, on the other hand, regarding funding methodologies. The IITA believes that these parties can articulate the two major approaches to funding as they did last time and give the Commission information needed to distinguish between these two major methodologies.

Q. If the Commission gives consideration to the approach proposed by AT&T in the previous phase of this proceeding (a surcharge on end user revenue), are there features of such an approach that the IITA believes are important?

A. Yes, the IITA believes that the basis for funding should be the intrastate end user retail revenues of the certificated carriers described in the statute under this general approach. Use of end user retail revenues is much fairer to the end users of the various carriers than the method proposed in the previous phase by MCI/WorldCom, the use of total revenues less payments to other carriers. The IITA would also recommend under this type of approach that the funding be based on current revenue levels rather than prior year levels. The use of current revenues allows the carriers to apply the surcharge level determined by the Commission directly to end user revenues without the necessity of making adjustments to account for changes in revenue levels between the assessment period and the collection period. The IITA would also recommend under this type of approach that the revenue base, against which the assessment is applied,

excludes any revenues collected to fund the IUSF. The fund administrator should, as part of its duties, determine the total funding basis from the certificated carriers and an assessment rate to be applied to the funding basis in order to generate the required support funds. This rate should be reviewed and approved by the Commission. As circumstances change, the administrator should propose changes to the assessment rate, as needed, to continue an adequate and appropriate level of funding.

**FUND ADMINISTRATION**

Q. Does Section 13-301(d) contain any specifications regarding the fund administrator?

A. No, it does not. The IITA believes, though, that it would be appropriate for the administrator of the Section 13-301(d) fund to be a neutral third party administrator as is required in Section 13-301(e). To facilitate initial implementation of the fund in the very short time that will be available, the IITA recommends that the ISCECA be appointed as the initial administrator of the fund.

**IMPLEMENTATION/TRANSITION ISSUES**

Q. Does the IITA have concerns regarding the anticipated transition between the current IUSF and DEM Weighting Funds and the new IUSF fund?

A. We do. Pursuant to the Commission's Order in Docket No. 98-0679, the DEM Weighting Fund will terminate no later than September 30, 2001. The current procedural schedule in these proceedings anticipates a Commission Order

sometime in September, 2001, only a few days before the DEM Weighting Fund terminates. Depending on the decisions made by the Commission in that Order, there will be very little time to effect implementation in order for funding to the new fund recipients to commence in October, 2001.

Q. What are some of the factors that could impact the ability to implement the Order quickly?

A. The funding method chosen would have a significant impact. If a new funding methodology is chosen, it may take time to gather data both in regard to the funding base and to the level of funding required to calculate funding assessment levels. If funding is based on an end user surcharge, it takes time to implement such charges in billing systems, to await the payment of funds to the company and to effectuate payment from the companies to the fund administrator in order for the administrator to have funds available to make disbursements. Depending on the Commission's decisions, these steps will not necessarily be able to be completed in just a few days.

Q. Have the parties discussed steps that could be taken to alleviate this concern?

A. In the workshop held on March 9, 2001, the parties did discuss this concern and agreed to hold a further workshop in June to attempt to address this issue and minimize the problem. The IITA encourages this process and will fully participate in it. However, it may be that the best efforts of the parties can only somewhat shorten the implementation period, not completely eliminate it. If that

is the case, there may be other steps necessary in order to avoid a discontinuity of funding.

Q. Does the IITA have any specific proposals at this time to deal with this potential problem?

A. No, it does not. However, the IITA feels that it is important to put the parties and the Commission on notice that this transition problem could occur and to alert them that some type of temporary measures may need to be adopted to address this concern.

Q. Could you summarize your testimony, please.

A. Yes. Pursuant to an Order of Commission, the Illinois DEM Weighting Fund will terminate no later than September 30, 2001. Current recipients of support from this Fund and the current IUSF will experience substantial losses of revenue unless that funding is replaced by the proposed new IUSF. The IITA has presented evidence to support the development of an IUSF under the provisions of Section 13-301(d) of the Act and to meet the requirements imposed by that Section. The IITA respectfully requests that the Commission approve the implementation of an IUSF as proposed so the Fund can be implemented effective October 1, 2001.

Q. Does this conclude your testimony?

A. Yes, it does.

| | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment #1 |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | Estimate of Current High Cost IUSF Support | | |
| 4 | | Illinois Small Telephone Companies | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | Company | 2000 IUSF Support | Lines | Support Per Line Per Month |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | Adams | $ 52,356 | 4,637 | $ 0.94 |
| 9 | Alhambra | 70,752 | 1,183 | 4.98 |
| 10 | Cambridge | 22,836 | 2,066 | 0.92 |
| 11 | Cass County | 97,200 | 3,179 | 2.55 |
| 12 | Clarksville | 4,428 | 232 | 1.59 |
| 13 | C-R | 48,408 | 990 | 4.07 |
| 14 | Crossville | 12,696 | 710 | 1.49 |
| 15 | Egyptian | 65,124 | 3,178 | 1.71 |
| 16 | El Paso | 290,520 | 2,133 | 11.35 |
| 17 | FC of Depue | 35,544 | 841 | 3.52 |
| 18 | FC of Illinois | 170,976 | 4,814 | 2.96 |
| 19 | FC of Lakeside | 4,092 | 894 | 0.38 |
| 20 | FC of Midland | 220,416 | 4,629 | 3.97 |
| 21 | FC of Mt. Pulaski | 27,972 | 1,947 | 1.20 |
| 22 | FC of Orion | 0 | 2,034 | - |
| 23 | FC of Prairie | 4,752 | 1,100 | 0.36 |
| 24 | FC of Schuyler | 13,848 | 3,041 | 0.38 |
| 25 | Flat Rock | 7,788 | 604 | 1.07 |
| 26 | Geneseo | 57,684 | 9,280 | 0.52 |
| 27 | Glasford | 11,196 | 1,363 | 0.68 |
| 28 | Grafton | 32,700 | 852 | 3.20 |
| 29 | Granview | 3,036 | - | - |
| 30 | Gridley | 134,268 | 1,441 | 7.76 |
| 31 | Hamilton | 130,308 | 2,615 | 4.15 |
| 32 | Harrisonville | 246,984 | 19,690 | 1.05 |
| 33 | Henry County | 21,444 | 1,742 | 1.03 |
| 34 | Home | 111,216 | 1,012 | 9.16 |
| 35 | Kinsman | 16,032 | 81 | 16.49 |
| 36 | LaHarpe | 41,496 | 1,105 | 3.13 |
| 37 | Leaf River | 89,304 | 610 | 12.20 |
| 38 | Leonore | 9,756 | 158 | 5.15 |
| 39 | Madison | 150,012 | 1,599 | 7.82 |
| 40 | Marseilles | 24,732 | 4,240 | 0.49 |
| 41 | McDonough | 69,156 | 4,466 | 1.29 |
| 42 | McNabb | 36,276 | 471 | 6.42 |
| 43 | Metamora | 77,940 | 4,228 | 1.54 |
| 44 | Mid Century | 109,584 | 4,855 | 1.88 |
| 45 | Montrose | 50,004 | 1,654 | 2.52 |
| 46 | Moultrie | 79,788 | 853 | 7.79 |
| 47 | New Windsor | 12,048 | 642 | 1.56 |
| 48 | Odin | 93,636 | 1,146 | 6.81 |
| 49 | Oneida | 8,472 | 609 | 1.16 |
| 50 | Reynolds | 10,452 | 585 | 1.49 |
| 51 | Shawnee | 68,700 | 4,682 | 1.22 |
| 52 | Stelle | 12,204 | 102 | 9.97 |
| 53 | Tonica | 20,004 | 523 | 3.19 |
| 54 | Viola Home | 12,000 | 854 | 1.17 |
| 55 | Wabash | 65,580 | 5,269 | 1.04 |
| 56 | Woodhull | 22,716 | 874 | 2.17 |
| 57 | Yates City | 21,564 | 580 | 3.10 |
| 58 | | | | |
| 59 | TOTAL | $ 3,000,000 | 116,393 | $ 2.15 |

| | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment #2 |
| 2 | | | | |
| 3 | | Estimate of Current DEM Support | | |
| 4 | | Illinois Small Telephone Companies | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | Company | 2000 DEM Support | Lines | Support Per Line Per Month |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | Adams | $ - | 4,637 | $ - |
| 9 | Alhambra | 240,447 | 1,183 | 16.94 |
| 10 | Cambridge | - | 2,066 | 0.00 |
| 11 | Cass County | 418,884 | 3,179 | 10.98 |
| 12 | Clarksville | - | 232 | 0.00 |
| 13 | C-R | 167,453 | 990 | 14.10 |
| 14 | Crossville | - | 710 | 0.00 |
| 15 | Egyptian | 331,827 | 3,178 | 8.70 |
| 16 | El Paso | 1,077,789 | 2,133 | 42.11 |
| 17 | FC of Depue | - | 841 | 0.00 |
| 18 | FC of Illinois | 722,637 | 4,814 | 12.51 |
| 19 | FC of Lakeside | 79,639 | 894 | 7.42 |
| 20 | FC of Midland | 730,409 | 4,629 | 13.15 |
| 21 | FC of Mt. Pulaski | 206,627 | 1,947 | 8.84 |
| 22 | FC of Orion | 111,476 | 2,034 | 4.57 |
| 23 | FC of Prairie | 108,840 | 1,100 | 8.25 |
| 24 | FC of Schuyler | 231,609 | 3,041 | 6.35 |
| 25 | Flat Rock | 116,081 | 604 | 16.02 |
| 26 | Geneseo | - | 9,280 | 0.00 |
| 27 | Glasford | - | 1,363 | 0.00 |
| 28 | Grafton | 175,745 | 852 | 17.19 |
| 29 | Granview | - | - | 0.00 |
| 30 | Gridley | 452,075 | 1,441 | 26.14 |
| 31 | Hamilton | - | 2,615 | 0.00 |
| 32 | Harrisonville | 816,573 | 19,690 | 3.46 |
| 33 | Henry County | - | 1,742 | 0.00 |
| 34 | Home | 503,600 | 1,012 | 41.47 |
| 35 | Kinsman | - | 81 | 0.00 |
| 36 | LaHarpe | 184,407 | 1,105 | 13.91 |
| 37 | Leaf River | 361,238 | 610 | 49.35 |
| 38 | Leonore | - | 158 | 0.00 |
| 39 | Madison | 648,727 | 1,599 | 33.81 |
| 40 | Marseilles | - | 4,240 | 0.00 |
| 41 | McDonough | - | 4,466 | 0.00 |
| 42 | McNabb | 62,310 | 471 | 11.02 |
| 43 | Metamora | - | 4,228 | 0.00 |
| 44 | Mid Century | - | 4,855 | 0.00 |
| 45 | Montrose | 265,960 | 1,654 | 13.40 |
| 46 | Moultrie | 433,515 | 853 | 42.35 |
| 47 | New Windsor | - | 642 | 0.00 |
| 48 | Odin | 257,349 | 1,146 | 18.71 |
| 49 | Oneida | 96,413 | 609 | 13.19 |
| 50 | Reynolds | - | 585 | 0.00 |
| 51 | Shawnee | 609,782 | 4,682 | 10.85 |
| 52 | Stelle | - | 102 | 0.00 |
| 53 | Tonica | - | 523 | 0.00 |
| 54 | Viola Home | - | 854 | 0.00 |
| 55 | Wabash | 545,593 | 5,269 | 8.63 |
| 56 | Woodhull | 193,193 | 874 | 18.42 |
| 57 | Yates City | 235,066 | 580 | 33.77 |
| 58 | | | | |
| 59 | TOTAL | $ 10,385,264 | 116,393 | $ 7.44 |

IITA Exhibit 2, Attachment 3

Illinois Independent Telephone Association
Proposed Default Input Changes
HAI Model 5.0a

1. Plant type assumptions - the HAI default assumes varying levels of buried, aerial, and underground plant in the different density zones. Because of the high predominance of buried plant construction in rural Illinois areas, the model default inputs have been modified for drops, distribution plant, and feeder plant to reflect a much larger percentage of buried plant and a smaller percentage of aerial plant than the default.

2. Fraction of buried plant available for shift - These fractions allow a portion of buried plant that has been identified using the normal plant algorithms to be shifted to aerial plant on a least-cost basis. These percentages have all been set to zero so the constructed plant is unchanged from the plant type assumptions provided for each density zone.

3. Structure sharing assumptions - Model default inputs assumes a significant portion of the cost of structures (pole lines, trenches for buried cable, trenches & conduit for underground cable) will be assigned to users other than the telephone company. These assumptions vary based on cable type and density zone and range from 100% to 25%. The IITA has assumed much less structure sharing than is assumed in the default inputs.

4. End Office switching investment, small ICO - Based on analysis of model results to actual investment data, the IITA has increased the default constant COE switching investment term from $416.11 per line to $658.25per line.

5. Tandem routed fraction of total interLATA and intraLATA traffic - Default assumptions for these factors have been increased from 20% to 90% to reflect the amount of traffic switched through tandem switches for the small Illinois companies.

6. The Total Interoffice Fraction Percentage has been changed from a default value of 65% to 45% to more accurately reflect traffic patterns of rural carriers.

7. Inputs for calculating the cost of capital have been revised to reflect a 40% debt ratio for the companies, a 9% cost of debt, and a 15% cost of equity for all the small companies except the Frontier companies where a 13.8% cost of equity has been assumed.

8. The forward looking network operations expense factor has been increased from the default 50% of current expense levels to 100% of current expense levels.

9. The monthly cost of local number portability has been decreased from a default level of $.25 per line to zero.

10. Billing/Billing Inquiry per line per month. Changed from default value of $1.22 to $3.62 to reflect Illinois costs of providing such services.

11. Carrier to Carrier Customer Service cost per year has been changed from a default value of $1.69 per line per year to $16.83 per line per year to reflect cost levels experienced by the small Illinois companies.

12. The alternative central office switching and central office transmission expense factors have been changed from their default values of 2.69% and 1.53% respectively to 7.0% and 7.5 % respectively to reflect costs experienced by small Illinois companies.

| | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | |
| 2 | *NOTE: This sheet diplays all user adjustable inputs which vary from HM 5.0a default settings* | | | |
| 3 | | | | |
| 4 | **Workfile Name:** | **C:\Program Files\HM50\WORKFILES\HMWKIL3409849999.XLS** | | |
| 5 | **Distribution Module Name:** | **C:\Program Files\HM50\MODULES\R50a_distribution.xls** | | |
| 6 | **Feeder Module Name:** | **C:\Program Files\HM50\MODULES\R50a_feeder.xls** | | |
| 7 | **Switching Module Name:** | **C:\Program Files\HM50\MODULES\R50a_switching_io.xls** | | |
| 8 | **Expense Module Name:** | **C:\Program Files\HM50\MODULES\R50a_expense_density.xls** | | |
| 9 | | | | |
| 10 | **Module/Table** | **Scenario Input** | **Scenario Value** | **Default Value** |
| 11 | Distribution | Buried Fraction - 0 | 0.95 | 0.75 |
| 12 | Distribution | Buried Fraction - 5 | 0.95 | 0.75 |
| 13 | Distribution | Buried Fraction - 100 | 0.95 | 0.75 |
| 14 | Distribution | Buried Fraction - 200 | 0.95 | 0.7 |
| 15 | Distribution | Buried Fraction - 650 | 0.85 | 0.7 |
| 16 | Distribution | Buried Fraction - 850 | 0.85 | 0.7 |
| 17 | Distribution | Buried Fraction - 2550 | 0.85 | 0.65 |
| 18 | Distribution | Aerial Cable Fraction - 0 | 0.05 | 0.25 |
| 19 | Distribution | Aerial Cable Fraction - 5 | 0.05 | 0.25 |
| 20 | Distribution | Aerial Cable Fraction - 100 | 0.05 | 0.25 |
| 21 | Distribution | Aerial Cable Fraction - 200 | 0.05 | 0.3 |
| 22 | Distribution | Aerial Cable Fraction - 650 | 0.05 | 0.3 |
| 23 | Distribution | Aerial Cable Fraction - 850 | 0.05 | 0.3 |
| 24 | Distribution | Aerial Cable Fraction - 2550 | 0.05 | 0.3 |
| 25 | Distribution | Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 0 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 26 | Distribution | Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 5 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 27 | Distribution | Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 100 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 28 | Distribution | Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 200 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 29 | Distribution | Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 650 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 30 | Distribution | Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 850 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 31 | Distribution | Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 2550 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 32 | Distribution | Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 5000 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 33 | Distribution | Buried Drop Sharing Fraction - 10000 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 34 | Distribution | Buried Drop Fraction - 0 | 0.95 | 0.75 |
| 35 | Distribution | Buried Drop Fraction - 5 | 0.95 | 0.75 |
| 36 | Distribution | Buried Drop Fraction - 100 | 0.95 | 0.75 |

| | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | Module/Table | Scenario Input | Scenario Value | Default Value |
| 37 | Distribution | Buried Drop Fraction - 200 | 0.95 | 0.7 |
| 38 | Distribution | Buried Drop Fraction - 650 | 0.95 | 0.7 |
| 39 | Distribution | Buried Drop Fraction - 850 | 0.95 | 0.7 |
| 40 | Distribution | Buried Drop Fraction - 2550 | 0.95 | 0.7 |
| 41 | Distribution | Buried fraction available for shift - 0 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 42 | Distribution | Buried fraction available for shift - 5 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 43 | Distribution | Buried fraction available for shift - 100 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 44 | Distribution | Buried fraction available for shift - 200 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 45 | Distribution | Buried fraction available for shift - 650 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 46 | Distribution | Buried fraction available for shift - 850 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 47 | Distribution | Buried fraction available for shift - 2550 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 48 | Feeder | Copper Aerial Fraction - 0 | 0.05 | 0.5 |
| 49 | Feeder | Copper Aerial Fraction - 5 | 0.05 | 0.5 |
| 50 | Feeder | Copper Aerial Fraction - 100 | 0.05 | 0.5 |
| 51 | Feeder | Copper Aerial Fraction - 200 | 0.05 | 0.4 |
| 52 | Feeder | Copper Aerial Fraction - 650 | 0.05 | 0.3 |
| 53 | Feeder | Copper Aerial Fraction - 850 | 0.05 | 0.2 |
| 54 | Feeder | Copper Aerial Fraction - 2550 | 0.05 | 0.15 |
| 55 | Feeder | Copper Buried Fraction - 0 | 0.95 | 0.45 |
| 56 | Feeder | Copper Buried Fraction - 5 | 0.95 | 0.45 |
| 57 | Feeder | Copper Buried Fraction - 100 | 0.95 | 0.45 |
| 58 | Feeder | Copper Buried Fraction - 200 | 0.95 | 0.4 |
| 59 | Feeder | Copper Buried Fraction - 650 | 0.85 | 0.3 |
| 60 | Feeder | Copper Buried Fraction - 850 | 0.85 | 0.2 |
| 61 | Feeder | Copper Buried Fraction - 2550 | 0.85 | 0.1 |
| 62 | Feeder | Fiber Aerial Fraction - 0 | 0.05 | 0.35 |
| 63 | Feeder | Fiber Aerial Fraction - 5 | 0.05 | 0.35 |
| 64 | Feeder | Fiber Aerial Fraction - 100 | 0.05 | 0.35 |
| 65 | Feeder | Fiber Aerial Fraction - 200 | 0.05 | 0.3 |
| 66 | Feeder | Fiber Aerial Fraction - 650 | 0.05 | 0.3 |
| 67 | Feeder | Fiber Aerial Fraction - 850 | 0.05 | 0.2 |
| 68 | Feeder | Fiber Aerial Fraction - 2550 | 0.05 | 0.15 |
| 69 | Feeder | Fiber Buried Fraction - 0 | 0.95 | 0.6 |
| 70 | Feeder | Fiber Buried Fraction - 5 | 0.95 | 0.6 |
| 71 | Feeder | Fiber Buried Fraction - 100 | 0.95 | 0.6 |

| | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | Module/Table | Scenario Input | Scenario Value | Default Value |
| 72 | Feeder | Fiber Buried Fraction - 200 | 0.95 | 0.6 |
| 73 | Feeder | Fiber Buried Fraction - 650 | 0.85 | 0.3 |
| 74 | Feeder | Fiber Buried Fraction - 850 | 0.85 | 0.2 |
| 75 | Feeder | Fiber Buried Fraction - 2550 | 0.85 | 0.1 |
| 76 | Feeder | Buried fraction available for shift - 0 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 77 | Feeder | Buried fraction available for shift - 5 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 78 | Feeder | Buried fraction available for shift - 100 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 79 | Feeder | Buried fraction available for shift - 200 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 80 | Feeder | Buried fraction available for shift - 650 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 81 | Feeder | Buried fraction available for shift - 850 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 82 | Feeder | Buried fraction available for shift - 2550 | 0 | 0.75 |
| 83 | Switching | Constant EO Switching Investment Term, small ICO | 658.25 | 416.11 |
| 84 | Switching | Total Interoffice Traffic Fraction | 0.45 | 0.65 |
| 85 | Switching | Tandem-routed Fraction of Total IntraLATA Traffic | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| 86 | Switching | Tandem-routed Fraction of Total InterLATA Traffic | 0.9 | 0.2 |
| 87 | Switching | Local Call Attempts | 8149 | 0 |
| 88 | Switching | Call Completion Factor | 0.7 | 0 |
| 89 | Switching | IntraLATA Calls Completed | 487 | 0 |
| 90 | Switching | InterLATA intrastate Calls Completed | 491 | 0 |
| 91 | Switching | InterLATA interstate Calls Completed | 1043 | 0 |
| 92 | Switching | Local DEMs, thousands | 35965 | 0 |
| 93 | Switching | Intrastate DEMs, thousands | 7679 | 0 |
| 94 | Switching | Interstate DEMs, thousands | 7581 | 0 |
| 95 | Switching | Fiber Investment, buried fraction | 0.9 | 0.6 |
| 96 | Switching | Fiber, aerial fraction | 0.05 | 0.2 |
| 97 | Switching | Fraction of Aerial Structure Assigned to Telephone | 0.5 | 0.33 |
| 98 | Switching | Fraction of Buried Structure Assigned to Telephone | 1 | 0.33 |
| 99 | Switching | Fraction of Underground Structure Assigned to Telephone | 1 | 0.33 |
| 100 | Expense | Cost of Debt | 0.09 | 0.077 |
| 101 | Expense | Debt Fraction | 0.4 | 0.45 |
| 102 | Expense | Cost of Equity | 0.15 | 0.119 |
| 103 | Expense | Billing/Bill Inquiry per line per month | 3.62 | 1.22 |
| 104 | Expense | Forward-looking Network Operations Factor | 1 | 0.5 |
| 105 | Expense | Alternative CO Switching Factor | 0.07 | 0.0269 |
| 106 | Expense | Alternative Circuit Equipment Factor | 0.075 | 0.0153 |

| | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | Module/Table | Scenario Input | Scenario Value | Default Value |
| 107 | Expense | Monthly LNP cost, per line | 0 | 0.25 |
| 108 | Expense | Carrier to Carrier Customer Service, per line per year | 16.83 | 1.69 |
| 109 | Expense | Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 0 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 110 | Expense | Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 5 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 111 | Expense | Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 100 | 1 | 0.25 |
| 112 | Expense | Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 200 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 113 | Expense | Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 650 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 114 | Expense | Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 850 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 115 | Expense | Distribution Aerial Shring Fraction - 2550 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 116 | Expense | Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 0 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 117 | Expense | Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 5 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 118 | Expense | Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 100 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 119 | Expense | Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 200 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 120 | Expense | Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 650 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 121 | Expense | Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 850 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 122 | Expense | Distribution Buried Shring Fraction - 2550 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 123 | Expense | Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 5 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 124 | Expense | Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 100 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 125 | Expense | Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 200 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 126 | Expense | Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 650 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 127 | Expense | Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 850 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 128 | Expense | Distribution Underground Shring Fraction - 2550 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 129 | Expense | Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 0 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 130 | Expense | Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 5 | 1 | 0.25 |
| 131 | Expense | Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 100 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 132 | Expense | Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 200 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 133 | Expense | Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 650 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 134 | Expense | Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 850 | 0.5 | 0.25 |
| 135 | Expense | Feeder Aerial Shring Fraction - 2550 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 136 | Expense | Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 0 | 1 | 0.5 |
| 137 | Expense | Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 5 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 138 | Expense | Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 100 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 139 | Expense | Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 200 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 140 | Expense | Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 650 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 141 | Expense | Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 850 | | |

| | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10 | Module/Table | Scenario Input | Scenario Value | Default Value |
| 142 | Expense | Feeder Underground Shring Fraction - 2550 | 1 | 0.33 |
| 143 | Expense | Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 0 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 144 | Expense | Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 5 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 145 | Expense | Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 100 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 146 | Expense | Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 200 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 147 | Expense | Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 650 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 148 | Expense | Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 850 | 1 | 0.4 |
| 149 | Expense | Feeder Buried Shring Fraction - 2550 | 1 | 0.4 |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F | G | H |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | | | | IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment 5 |
| 2 | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | | | | Calculation of Illinois Supportable USF Requirement | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Company | HAI USF Cost | Proposed Affordable Rate | Economic Cost Over Affordable Rate | Access Lines | Potential Support | Federal Support Funds | IUSF Eligibility Amount-Individual Company Determination |
| 6 | Adams | $ 125.87 | $ 12.62 | $ 113.25 | 4,637 | $ 6,301,894 | $ 1,073,589 | $ 5,228,305 |
| 7 | Alhambra | 104.35 | 17.14 | 87.20 | 1,183 | 1,237,901 | 287,398 | 950,503 |
| 8 | Cambridge | 73.90 | 17.31 | 56.59 | 2,066 | 1,403,041 | 201,768 | 1,201,273 |
| 9 | Cass County | 89.73 | 20.69 | 69.04 | 3,179 | 2,633,758 | 725,570 | 1,908,188 |
| 10 | Clarksville | 273.89 | 15.05 | 258.85 | 232 | 720,629 | 65,778 | 654,851 |
| 11 | C-R | 125.56 | 19.77 | 105.79 | 990 | 1,256,746 | 837,659 | 419,087 |
| 12 | Crossville | 116.23 | 16.35 | 99.88 | 710 | 850,947 | 146,372 | 704,575 |
| 13 | Egyptian | 121.26 | 13.46 | 107.80 | 3,178 | 4,111,024 | 1,639,776 | 2,471,248 |
| 14 | El Paso | 78.15 | 20.89 | 57.26 | 2,133 | 1,465,689 | 589,835 | 875,854 |
| 15 | FC of Depue | 70.08 | 22.10 | 47.98 | 841 | 484,242 | 170,564 | 313,678 |
| 16 | FC of Illinois | 88.90 | 19.44 | 69.45 | 4,814 | 4,012,109 | 261,777 | 3,750,332 |
| 17 | FC of Lakeside | 129.48 | 26.14 | 103.34 | 894 | 1,108,655 | 435,415 | 673,240 |
| 18 | FC of Midland | 123.30 | 20.06 | 103.24 | 4,629 | 5,734,674 | 351,449 | 5,383,225 |
| 19 | FC of Mt. Pulaski | 88.70 | 18.34 | 70.36 | 1,947 | 1,643,851 | 764,041 | 879,810 |
| 20 | FC of Orion | 62.68 | 20.43 | 42.25 | 2,034 | 1,031,209 | 385,126 | 646,083 |
| 21 | FC of Prairie | 106.42 | 20.20 | 86.21 | 1,100 | 1,138,037 | 164,771 | 973,266 |
| 22 | FC of Schuyler | 72.93 | 20.57 | 52.37 | 3,041 | 1,910,921 | 198,134 | 1,712,787 |
| 23 | Flat Rock | 156.27 | 21.61 | 134.65 | 604 | 975,956 | 238,534 | 737,422 |
| 24 | Geneseo | 47.76 | 13.29 | 34.47 | 9,280 | 3,838,328 | 525,312 | 3,313,016 |
| 25 | Glasford | 73.61 | 4.03 | 69.58 | 1,363 | 1,137,983 | 207,423 | 930,560 |
| 26 | Grafton | 85.19 | 19.61 | 65.58 | 852 | 670,529 | 486,135 | 184,394 |
| 28 | Gridley | 75.59 | 21.90 | 53.70 | 1,441 | 928,506 | 606,285 | 322,221 |
| 29 | Hamilton | 164.21 | 18.70 | 145.51 | 2,615 | 4,566,129 | 577,021 | 3,989,108 |
| 30 | Harrisonville | 56.53 | 19.18 | 37.35 | 19,690 | 8,824,158 | 5,359,140 | 3,465,018 |
| 31 | Henry County | 85.12 | 17.95 | 67.16 | 1,742 | 1,403,988 | 181,212 | 1,222,776 |
| 32 | Home | 71.30 | 21.75 | 49.55 | 1,012 | 601,687 | 1,236,154 | (634,467) |
| 33 | Kinsman | 173.85 | 4.00 | 169.85 | 81 | 165,097 | 42,430 | 122,667 |
| 34 | LaHarpe | 101.11 | 20.45 | 80.66 | 1,105 | 1,069,525 | 686,495 | 383,030 |
| 35 | Leaf River | 106.57 | 25.59 | 80.98 | 610 | 592,794 | 616,946 | (24,152) |
| 36 | Leonore | 168.64 | 11.66 | 156.99 | 158 | 297,647 | 61,195 | 236,452 |
| 37 | Madison | 88.74 | 20.25 | 68.49 | 1,599 | 1,314,202 | 1,782,539 | (468,337) |
| 38 | Marseilles | 47.95 | 13.40 | 34.55 | 4,240 | 1,757,665 | 744,705 | 1,012,960 |
| 39 | McDonough | 138.28 | 19.72 | 118.56 | 4,466 | 6,353,747 | 1,067,235 | 5,286,512 |
| 40 | McNabb | 107.11 | 19.39 | 87.73 | 471 | 495,833 | 227,575 | 268,258 |
| 41 | Metamora | 63.73 | 21.51 | 42.22 | 4,228 | 2,141,823 | 707,906 | 1,433,917 |
| 42 | Mid Century | 135.46 | 15.31 | 120.15 | 4,855 | 6,999,819 | 1,006,944 | 5,992,875 |
| 43 | Montrose | 155.62 | 17.98 | 137.64 | 1,654 | 2,731,936 | 284,395 | 2,447,541 |
| 44 | Moultrie | 74.53 | 20.19 | 54.34 | 853 | 556,211 | 598,212 | (42,001) |
| 45 | New Windsor | 77.17 | 15.69 | 61.48 | 642 | 473,616 | 125,887 | 347,729 |
| 46 | Odin | 86.53 | 20.51 | 66.02 | 1,146 | 907,950 | 786,299 | 121,651 |
| 47 | Oneida | 81.30 | 12.13 | 69.17 | 609 | 505,508 | 125,564 | 379,944 |
| 48 | Reynolds | 92.82 | 14.08 | 78.74 | 585 | 552,782 | 124,408 | 428,374 |
| 49 | Shawnee | 138.39 | 18.37 | 120.01 | 4,682 | 6,742,862 | 1,066,760 | 5,676,102 |
| 50 | Stelle | 200.87 | 5.12 | 195.75 | 102 | 239,600 | 42,559 | 197,041 |
| 51 | Tonica | 88.65 | 31.20 | 57.45 | 523 | 360,527 | 108,406 | 252,121 |
| 52 | Viola Home | 84.70 | 12.62 | 72.08 | 854 | 738,680 | 152,744 | 585,936 |
| 53 | Wabash | 122.76 | 18.98 | 103.78 | 5,269 | 6,561,835 | 779,964 | 5,781,871 |
| 54 | Woodhull | 92.61 | 14.41 | 78.20 | 874 | 820,171 | 238,610 | 581,561 |
| 55 | Yates City | 106.69 | 22.89 | 83.79 | 580 | 583,194 | 283,062 | 300,132 |
| 56 | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | Total Small Companies | $ 91.67 | $ 17.96 | $ 73.71 | 116,393 | $ 102,955,615 | $ 29,377,078 | $ 73,578,537 |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | | IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment 6 |
| 2 | | | | | | |
| 3 | Comparison of Access Cost to Access Revenue | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | Company Name | HAI Rate | Actual Rate | HAI Revenue | Actual Revenue | Actual over HAI |
| 6 | Adams | $ 0.06144 | $ 0.06315 | $ 1,156,425 | $ 1,188,609 | $ 32,184 |
| 7 | Alhambra | 0.04908 | 0.03699 | 352,647 | 265,767 | (86,879) |
| 8 | Cambridge | 0.05253 | 0.04566 | 288,018 | 250,368 | (37,650) |
| 9 | Cass County | 0.04972 | 0.02724 | 616,166 | 337,565 | (278,601) |
| 10 | Clarksville | 0.28407 | 0.07434 | 176,225 | 46,117 | (130,108) |
| 11 | C-R | 0.08535 | 0.05600 | 489,816 | 321,419 | (168,397) |
| 12 | Crossville | 0.13581 | 0.05418 | 15,985 | 6,377 | (9,608) |
| 13 | Egyptian | 0.10362 | 0.05410 | 1,996,213 | 1,042,238 | (953,975) |
| 14 | El Paso | 0.05881 | 0.03427 | 664,453 | 387,219 | (277,233) |
| 15 | FC of Depue | 0.05794 | 0.04222 | 217,948 | 158,793 | (59,155) |
| 16 | FC of Illinois | 0.07945 | 0.01157 | 2,399,717 | 349,414 | (2,050,303) |
| 17 | FC of Lakeside | 0.14930 | 0.01157 | 549,317 | 42,561 | (506,756) |
| 18 | FC of Midland | 0.10763 | 0.01157 | 3,870,847 | 416,021 | (3,454,826) |
| 19 | FC of Mt. Pulaski | 0.06227 | 0.01157 | 486,963 | 90,462 | (396,501) |
| 20 | FC of Orion | 0.03473 | 0.01157 | 197,996 | 65,943 | (132,053) |
| 21 | FC of Prairie | 0.10504 | 0.01157 | 499,133 | 54,969 | (444,164) |
| 22 | FC of Schuyler | 0.02651 | 0.01157 | 271,957 | 118,688 | (153,269) |
| 23 | Flat Rock | 0.33836 | 0.04186 | 827,567 | 102,393 | (725,175) |
| 24 | Geneseo | 0.02748 | 0.03119 | 737,555 | 837,184 | 99,629 |
| 25 | Glasford | 0.04002 | 0.03829 | 219,775 | 210,295 | (9,480) |
| 26 | Grafton | 0.03461 | 0.04018 | 160,653 | 186,481 | 25,828 |
| 28 | Gridley | 0.06602 | 0.03880 | 395,633 | 232,485 | (163,148) |
| 29 | Hamilton | 0.15635 | 0.03426 | 2,561,389 | 561,180 | (2,000,209) |
| 30 | Harrisonville | 0.03195 | 0.01159 | 2,179,548 | 790,887 | (1,388,661) |
| 31 | Henry County | 0.08573 | 0.05109 | 367,708 | 219,112 | (148,596) |
| 32 | Home | 0.03493 | 0.05850 | 218,186 | 365,452 | 147,267 |
| 33 | Kinsman | 0.08973 | 0.10253 | 72,537 | 82,882 | 10,345 |
| 34 | LaHarpe | 0.14520 | 0.04772 | 423,255 | 139,096 | (284,159) |
| 35 | Leaf River | 0.09834 | 0.11240 | 270,065 | 308,670 | 38,605 |
| 36 | Leonore | 0.12680 | 0.08374 | 92,611 | 61,164 | (31,447) |
| 37 | Madison | 0.06598 | 0.09550 | 864,601 | 1,251,337 | 386,736 |
| 38 | Marseilles | 0.02110 | 0.02564 | 436,754 | 530,569 | 93,815 |
| 39 | McDonough | 0.16608 | 0.04064 | 1,974,422 | 483,134 | (1,491,288) |
| 40 | McNabb | 0.06635 | 0.04465 | 176,914 | 119,049 | (57,865) |
| 41 | Metamora | 0.02853 | 0.02907 | 597,275 | 608,668 | 11,393 |
| 42 | Mid Century | 0.11610 | 0.04720 | 2,198,336 | 893,773 | (1,304,563) |
| 43 | Montrose | 0.21858 | 0.04462 | 1,789,989 | 365,365 | (1,424,624) |
| 44 | Moultrie | 0.06157 | 0.09744 | 387,893 | 613,892 | 225,999 |
| 45 | New Windsor | 0.06890 | 0.04820 | 171,679 | 120,098 | (51,581) |
| 46 | Odin | 0.05002 | 0.05587 | 288,932 | 322,726 | 33,794 |
| 47 | Oneida | 0.14072 | 0.05767 | 271,826 | 111,406 | (160,420) |
| 48 | Reynolds | 0.04785 | 0.05100 | 131,191 | 139,828 | 8,637 |
| 49 | Shawnee | 0.22307 | 0.04644 | 3,532,766 | 735,459 | (2,797,308) |
| 50 | Stelle | 0.13415 | 0.29407 | 18,416 | 40,370 | 21,954 |
| 51 | Tonica | 0.04510 | 0.04791 | 141,069 | 149,867 | 8,798 |
| 52 | Viola Home | 0.06743 | 0.04829 | 215,715 | 154,499 | (61,216) |
| 53 | Wabash | 0.05659 | 0.03154 | 1,123,115 | 625,884 | (497,231) |
| 54 | Woodhull | 0.08957 | 0.05352 | 244,749 | 146,232 | (98,518) |
| 55 | Yates City | 0.05110 | 0.05036 | 130,241 | 128,356 | (1,885) |
| 56 | | | | | | |
| 57 | Total Small Companies | $ 0.07587 | $ 0.03398 | $ 37,472,191 | $ 16,780,322 | $ (20,691,869) |

| | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment #1 |
| 2 | | | | **REVISED** |
| 3 | | Estimate of Current High Cost IUSF Support | | |
| 4 | | Illinois Small Telephone Companies | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | Company | 2000 IUSF Support | Lines | Support Per Line Per Month |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | Adams | $ 52,356 | 4,637 | $ 0.94 |
| 9 | Alhambra | 70,752 | 1,183 | 4.98 |
| 10 | Cambridge | 22,836 | 2,066 | 0.92 |
| 11 | Cass County | 97,200 | 3,179 | 2.55 |
| 12 | Clarksville | 4,428 | 232 | 1.59 |
| 13 | C-R | 48,408 | 990 | 4.07 |
| 14 | Crossville | 12,696 | 710 | 1.49 |
| 15 | Egyptian | 290,520 | 3,178 | 7.62 |
| 16 | El Paso | 65,124 | 2,133 | 2.54 |
| 17 | FC of Depue | 35,544 | 841 | 3.52 |
| 18 | FC of Illinois | 170,976 | 4,814 | 2.96 |
| 19 | FC of Lakeside | 4,092 | 894 | 0.38 |
| 20 | FC of Midland | 220,416 | 4,629 | 3.97 |
| 21 | FC of Mt. Pulaski | 27,972 | 1,947 | 1.20 |
| 22 | FC of Orion | 0 | 2,034 | - |
| 23 | FC of Prairie | 4,752 | 1,100 | 0.36 |
| 24 | FC of Schuyler | 13,848 | 3,041 | 0.38 |
| 25 | Flat Rock | 7,788 | 604 | 1.07 |
| 26 | Geneseo | 57,684 | 9,280 | 0.52 |
| 27 | Glasford | 11,196 | 1,363 | 0.68 |
| 28 | Grafton | 32,700 | 852 | 3.20 |
| 29 | Grandview | 3,036 | - | - |
| 30 | Gridley | 134,268 | 1,441 | 7.76 |
| 31 | Hamilton | 130,308 | 2,615 | 4.15 |
| 32 | Harrisonville | 246,984 | 19,478 | 1.06 |
| 33 | Henry County | 21,444 | 1,742 | 1.03 |
| 34 | Home | 111,216 | 1,012 | 9.16 |
| 35 | Kinsman | 16,032 | 81 | 16.49 |
| 36 | LaHarpe | 41,496 | 1,105 | 3.13 |
| 37 | Leaf River | 89,304 | 610 | 12.20 |
| 38 | Leonore | 9,756 | 158 | 5.15 |
| 39 | Madison | 150,012 | 1,599 | 7.82 |
| 40 | Marseilles | 24,732 | 4,240 | 0.49 |
| 41 | McDonough | 69,156 | 4,466 | 1.29 |
| 42 | McNabb | 36,276 | 471 | 6.42 |
| 43 | Metamora | 77,940 | 4,228 | 1.54 |
| 44 | Mid Century | 109,584 | 4,855 | 1.88 |
| 45 | Montrose | 50,004 | 1,654 | 2.52 |
| 46 | Moultrie | 79,788 | 853 | 7.79 |
| 47 | New Windsor | 12,048 | 642 | 1.56 |
| 48 | Odin | 93,636 | 1,146 | 6.81 |
| 49 | Oneida | 8,472 | 609 | 1.16 |
| 50 | Reynolds | 10,452 | 585 | 1.49 |
| 51 | Shawnee | 68,700 | 4,682 | 1.22 |
| 52 | Stelle | 12,204 | 102 | 9.97 |
| 53 | Tonica | 20,004 | 523 | 3.19 |
| 54 | Viola Home | 12,000 | 854 | 1.17 |
| 55 | Wabash | 65,580 | 5,269 | 1.04 |
| 56 | Woodhull | 22,716 | 754 | 2.51 |
| 57 | Yates City | 21,564 | 580 | 3.10 |
| 58 | | | | |
| 59 | TOTAL | $ 3,000,000 | 116,061 | $ 2.15 |

| | A | B | C | D |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment #2 |
| 2 | | | | **REVISED** |
| 3 | | Estimate of Current DEM Support | | |
| 4 | | Illinois Small Telephone Companies | | |
| 5 | | | | |
| 6 | Company | 2000 DEM Support | Lines | Support Per Line Per Month |
| 7 | | | | |
| 8 | Adams | $ - | 4,637 | $ - |
| 9 | Alhambra | 240,447 | 1,183 | 16.94 |
| 10 | Cambridge | - | 2,066 | 0.00 |
| 11 | Cass County | 418,884 | 3,179 | 10.98 |
| 12 | Clarksville | - | 232 | 0.00 |
| 13 | C-R | 167,453 | 990 | 14.10 |
| 14 | Crossville | - | 710 | 0.00 |
| 15 | Egyptian | 1,077,789 | 3,178 | 28.26 |
| 16 | El Paso | 331,827 | 2,133 | 12.96 |
| 17 | FC of Depue | - | 841 | 0.00 |
| 18 | FC of Illinois | 722,637 | 4,814 | 12.51 |
| 19 | FC of Lakeside | 79,639 | 894 | 7.42 |
| 20 | FC of Midland | 730,409 | 4,629 | 13.15 |
| 21 | FC of Mt. Pulaski | 206,627 | 1,947 | 8.84 |
| 22 | FC of Orion | 111,476 | 2,034 | 4.57 |
| 23 | FC of Prairie | 108,840 | 1,100 | 8.25 |
| 24 | FC of Schuyler | 231,609 | 3,041 | 6.35 |
| 25 | Flat Rock | 116,081 | 604 | 16.02 |
| 26 | Geneseo | - | 9,280 | 0.00 |
| 27 | Glasford | - | 1,363 | 0.00 |
| 28 | Grafton | 175,745 | 852 | 17.19 |
| 29 | Granview | - | - | 0.00 |
| 30 | Gridley | 452,075 | 1,441 | 26.14 |
| 31 | Hamilton | - | 2,615 | 0.00 |
| 32 | Harrisonville | 816,573 | 19,478 | 3.49 |
| 33 | Henry County | - | 1,742 | 0.00 |
| 34 | Home | 503,600 | 1,012 | 41.47 |
| 35 | Kinsman | - | 81 | 0.00 |
| 36 | LaHarpe | 184,407 | 1,105 | 13.91 |
| 37 | Leaf River | 361,238 | 610 | 49.35 |
| 38 | Leonore | - | 158 | 0.00 |
| 39 | Madison | 648,727 | 1,599 | 33.81 |
| 40 | Marseilles | - | 4,240 | 0.00 |
| 41 | McDonough | - | 4,466 | 0.00 |
| 42 | McNabb | 62,310 | 471 | 11.02 |
| 43 | Metamora | - | 4,228 | 0.00 |
| 44 | Mid Century | - | 4,855 | 0.00 |
| 45 | Montrose | 265,960 | 1,654 | 13.40 |
| 46 | Moultrie | 433,515 | 853 | 42.35 |
| 47 | New Windsor | - | 642 | 0.00 |
| 48 | Odin | 257,349 | 1,146 | 18.71 |
| 49 | Oneida | 96,413 | 609 | 13.19 |
| 50 | Reynolds | - | 585 | 0.00 |
| 51 | Shawnee | 609,782 | 4,682 | 10.85 |
| 52 | Stelle | - | 102 | 0.00 |
| 53 | Tonica | - | 523 | 0.00 |
| 54 | Viola Home | - | 854 | 0.00 |
| 55 | Wabash | 545,593 | 5,269 | 8.63 |
| 56 | Woodhull | 193,193 | 754 | 21.35 |
| 57 | Yates City | 235,066 | 580 | 33.77 |
| 58 | | | | |
| 59 | TOTAL | $ 10,385,264 | 116,061 | $ 7.46 |

| | A | B | C | D | E | H | I | J |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | | | IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment 5 | |
| 2 | | | | | | | | **REVISED** |
| 3 | | | Calculation of Illinois Supportable USF Requirement | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | Company | HAI USF Cost | Proposed Affordable Rate | Economic Cost Over Affordable Rate | Access Lines | Potential Support | Federal Support Funds | IUSF Eligibility Amount-Individual Company Determination |
| 6 | Adams | $ 125.87 | $ 12.62 | $ 113.25 | 4,637 | $ 6,301,894 | $ 1,073,589 | $ 5,228,305 |
| 7 | Alhambra | 104.35 | 17.14 | 87.20 | 1,183 | 1,237,901 | 287,398 | 950,503 |
| 8 | Cambridge | 73.90 | 17.31 | 56.59 | 2,066 | 1,403,041 | 201,768 | 1,201,273 |
| 9 | Cass County | 89.73 | 20.69 | 69.04 | 3,179 | 2,633,758 | 725,570 | 1,908,188 |
| 10 | Clarksville | 273.89 | 15.05 | 258.85 | 232 | 720,629 | 65,778 | 654,851 |
| 11 | C-R | 125.56 | 19.77 | 105.79 | 990 | 1,256,746 | 837,659 | 419,087 |
| 12 | Crossville | 116.23 | 16.35 | 99.88 | 710 | 850,947 | 146,372 | 704,575 |
| 13 | Egyptian | 121.26 | 13.46 | 107.80 | 3,178 | 4,111,024 | 1,639,776 | 2,471,248 |
| 14 | El Paso | 78.15 | 20.89 | 57.26 | 2,133 | 1,465,689 | 589,835 | 875,854 |
| 15 | FC of Depue | 70.08 | 22.10 | 47.98 | 841 | 484,242 | 170,564 | 313,678 |
| 16 | FC of Illinois | 88.90 | 19.44 | 69.45 | 4,814 | 4,012,109 | 261,777 | 3,750,332 |
| 17 | FC of Lakeside | 129.48 | 26.14 | 103.34 | 894 | 1,108,655 | 435,415 | 673,240 |
| 18 | FC of Midland | 123.30 | 20.06 | 103.24 | 4,629 | 5,734,674 | 351,449 | 5,383,225 |
| 19 | FC of Mt. Pulaski | 88.70 | 18.34 | 70.36 | 1,947 | 1,643,851 | 764,041 | 879,810 |
| 20 | FC of Orion | 62.68 | 20.43 | 42.25 | 2,034 | 1,031,209 | 385,126 | 646,083 |
| 21 | FC of Prairie | 106.42 | 20.20 | 86.21 | 1,100 | 1,138,037 | 164,771 | 973,266 |
| 22 | FC of Schuyler | 72.93 | 20.57 | 52.37 | 3,041 | 1,910,921 | 198,134 | 1,712,787 |
| 23 | Flat Rock | 156.27 | 21.61 | 134.65 | 604 | 975,956 | 238,534 | 737,422 |
| 24 | Geneseo | 47.76 | 13.29 | 34.47 | 9,280 | 3,838,328 | 525,312 | 3,313,016 |
| 25 | Glasford | 73.61 | 4.03 | 69.58 | 1,363 | 1,137,983 | 207,423 | 930,560 |
| 26 | Grafton | 85.19 | 19.61 | 65.58 | 852 | 670,529 | 486,135 | 184,394 |
| 28 | Gridley | 75.59 | 21.90 | 53.70 | 1,441 | 928,506 | 606,285 | 322,221 |
| 29 | Hamilton | 164.21 | 18.70 | 145.51 | 2,615 | 4,566,129 | 577,021 | 3,989,108 |
| 30 | Harrisonville | 56.53 | 19.32 | 37.21 | 19,478 | 8,696,670 | 5,359,140 | 3,337,530 |
| 31 | Henry County | 85.12 | 17.95 | 67.16 | 1,742 | 1,403,988 | 181,212 | 1,222,776 |
| 32 | Home | 71.30 | 21.75 | 49.55 | 1,012 | 601,687 | 1,236,154 | (634,467) |
| 33 | Kinsman | 173.85 | 4.00 | 169.85 | 81 | 165,097 | 42,430 | 122,667 |
| 34 | LaHarpe | 101.11 | 20.45 | 80.66 | 1,105 | 1,069,525 | 686,495 | 383,030 |
| 35 | Leaf River | 106.57 | 25.59 | 80.98 | 610 | 592,794 | 616,946 | (24,152) |
| 36 | Leonore | 168.64 | 11.66 | 156.99 | 158 | 297,647 | 61,195 | 236,452 |
| 37 | Madison | 88.74 | 20.25 | 68.49 | 1,599 | 1,314,202 | 1,782,539 | (468,337) |
| 38 | Marseilles | 47.95 | 13.40 | 34.55 | 4,240 | 1,757,665 | 744,705 | 1,012,960 |
| 39 | McDonough | 138.28 | 19.72 | 118.56 | 4,466 | 6,353,747 | 1,067,235 | 5,286,512 |
| 40 | McNabb | 107.11 | 19.39 | 87.73 | 471 | 495,833 | 227,575 | 268,258 |
| 41 | Metamora | 63.73 | 21.51 | 42.22 | 4,228 | 2,141,823 | 707,906 | 1,433,917 |
| 42 | Mid Century | 135.46 | 15.31 | 120.15 | 4,855 | 6,999,819 | 1,006,944 | 5,992,875 |
| 43 | Montrose | 155.62 | 17.98 | 137.64 | 1,654 | 2,731,936 | 284,395 | 2,447,541 |
| 44 | Moultrie | 74.53 | 20.19 | 54.34 | 853 | 556,211 | 458,998 | 97,213 |
| 45 | New Windsor | 77.17 | 15.69 | 61.48 | 642 | 473,616 | 125,887 | 347,729 |
| 46 | Odin | 86.53 | 20.51 | 66.02 | 1,146 | 907,950 | 786,299 | 121,651 |
| 47 | Oneida | 81.30 | 12.13 | 69.17 | 609 | 505,508 | 125,564 | 379,944 |
| 48 | Reynolds | 92.82 | 14.08 | 78.74 | 585 | 552,782 | 124,408 | 428,374 |
| 49 | Shawnee | 138.39 | 18.37 | 120.01 | 4,682 | 6,742,862 | 1,066,760 | 5,676,102 |
| 50 | Stelle | 200.87 | 5.12 | 195.75 | 102 | 239,600 | 42,559 | 197,041 |
| 51 | Tonica | 88.65 | 31.20 | 57.45 | 523 | 360,527 | 108,406 | 252,121 |
| 52 | Viola Home | 84.70 | 12.62 | 72.08 | 854 | 738,680 | 152,744 | 585,936 |
| 53 | Wabash | 122.76 | 18.98 | 103.78 | 5,269 | 6,561,835 | 779,964 | 5,781,871 |
| 54 | Woodhull | 92.61 | 14.21 | 78.40 | 754 | 709,390 | 238,610 | 470,780 |
| 55 | Yates City | 106.69 | 22.89 | 83.79 | 580 | 583,194 | 283,062 | 300,132 |
| 56 | | | | | | | | |
| 57 | Total Small Companies | $ 91.74 | $ 17.98 | $ 73.75 | 116,061 | $ 102,717,346 | $ 29,237,864 | $ 73,479,482 |

| | A | B | C | D | E | F |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | | | | | | IITA Exhibit #2, Attachment 6 |
| 2 | | | | | | **REVISED** |
| 3 | Comparison of Access Cost to Access Revenue | | | | | |
| 4 | | | | | | |
| 5 | Company Name | HAI Rate | Actual Rate | HAI Revenue | Actual Revenue | Actual over HAI |
| 6 | Adams | $ 0.06144 | $ 0.06315 | $ 1,156,425 | $ 1,188,609 | $ 32,184 |
| 7 | Alhambra | 0.04908 | 0.03699 | 352,647 | 265,767 | (86,879) |
| 8 | Cambridge | 0.05253 | 0.04566 | 288,018 | 250,368 | (37,650) |
| 9 | Cass County | 0.04972 | 0.02724 | 616,166 | 337,565 | (278,601) |
| 10 | Clarksville | 0.28407 | 0.07434 | 176,225 | 46,117 | (130,108) |
| 11 | C-R | 0.08535 | 0.05600 | 489,816 | 321,419 | (168,397) |
| 12 | Crossville | 0.13581 | 0.05418 | 295,048 | 117,702 | (177,346) |
| 13 | Egyptian | 0.10362 | 0.05410 | 1,996,213 | 1,042,238 | (953,975) |
| 14 | El Paso | 0.05881 | 0.03427 | 664,453 | 387,219 | (277,233) |
| 15 | FC of Depue | 0.05794 | 0.04222 | 217,948 | 158,793 | (59,155) |
| 16 | FC of Illinois | 0.07945 | 0.01157 | 2,399,717 | 349,414 | (2,050,303) |
| 17 | FC of Lakeside | 0.14930 | 0.01157 | 549,317 | 42,561 | (506,756) |
| 18 | FC of Midland | 0.10763 | 0.01157 | 3,870,847 | 416,021 | (3,454,826) |
| 19 | FC of Mt. Pulaski | 0.06227 | 0.01157 | 486,963 | 90,462 | (396,501) |
| 20 | FC of Orion | 0.03473 | 0.01157 | 197,996 | 65,943 | (132,053) |
| 21 | FC of Prairie | 0.10504 | 0.01157 | 499,133 | 54,969 | (444,164) |
| 22 | FC of Schuyler | 0.02651 | 0.01157 | 271,957 | 118,688 | (153,269) |
| 23 | Flat Rock | 0.33836 | 0.04186 | 827,567 | 102,393 | (725,175) |
| 24 | Geneseo | 0.02748 | 0.03119 | 737,555 | 837,184 | 99,629 |
| 25 | Glasford | 0.04002 | 0.03829 | 219,775 | 210,295 | (9,480) |
| 26 | Grafton | 0.03461 | 0.04018 | 160,653 | 186,481 | 25,828 |
| 28 | Gridley | 0.06602 | 0.03880 | 395,633 | 232,485 | (163,148) |
| 29 | Hamilton | 0.15635 | 0.03426 | 2,561,389 | 561,180 | (2,000,209) |
| 30 | Harrisonville | 0.03195 | 0.01159 | 2,179,548 | 790,887 | (1,388,661) |
| 31 | Henry County | 0.08573 | 0.05109 | 367,708 | 219,112 | (148,596) |
| 32 | Home | 0.03493 | 0.05850 | 218,186 | 365,452 | 147,267 |
| 33 | Kinsman | 0.08973 | 0.10253 | 72,537 | 82,882 | 10,345 |
| 34 | LaHarpe | 0.14520 | 0.04772 | 423,255 | 139,096 | (284,159) |
| 35 | Leaf River | 0.09834 | 0.11240 | 270,065 | 308,670 | 38,605 |
| 36 | Leonore | 0.12680 | 0.08374 | 92,611 | 61,164 | (31,447) |
| 37 | Madison | 0.06598 | 0.09550 | 864,601 | 1,251,337 | 386,736 |
| 38 | Marseilles | 0.02110 | 0.02564 | 436,754 | 530,569 | 93,815 |
| 39 | McDonough | 0.16608 | 0.04064 | 1,974,422 | 483,134 | (1,491,288) |
| 40 | McNabb | 0.06635 | 0.04465 | 176,914 | 119,049 | (57,865) |
| 41 | Metamora | 0.02853 | 0.02907 | 597,275 | 608,668 | 11,393 |
| 42 | Mid Century | 0.11610 | 0.04720 | 2,198,336 | 893,773 | (1,304,563) |
| 43 | Montrose | 0.21858 | 0.04462 | 1,789,989 | 365,365 | (1,424,624) |
| 44 | Moultrie | 0.06157 | 0.09744 | 261,322 | 413,576 | 152,254 |
| 45 | New Windsor | 0.06890 | 0.04820 | 171,679 | 120,098 | (51,581) |
| 46 | Odin | 0.05002 | 0.05587 | 288,932 | 322,726 | 33,794 |
| 47 | Oneida | 0.14072 | 0.05767 | 271,826 | 111,406 | (160,420) |
| 48 | Reynolds | 0.04785 | 0.05100 | 131,191 | 139,828 | 8,637 |
| 49 | Shawnee | 0.22307 | 0.04644 | 3,532,766 | 735,459 | (2,797,308) |
| 50 | Stelle | 0.13415 | 0.29407 | 18,416 | 40,370 | 21,954 |
| 51 | Tonica | 0.04510 | 0.04791 | 141,069 | 149,867 | 8,798 |
| 52 | Viola Home | 0.06743 | 0.04829 | 215,715 | 154,499 | (61,216) |
| 53 | Wabash | 0.05659 | 0.03154 | 1,123,115 | 625,884 | (497,231) |
| 54 | Woodhull | 0.08957 | 0.05352 | 244,749 | 146,232 | (98,518) |
| 55 | Yates City | 0.05110 | 0.05036 | 130,241 | 128,356 | (1,885) |
| 56 | | | | | | |
| 57 | Total Small Companies | $ 0.07618 | $ 0.03380 | $ 37,624,682 | $ 16,691,332 | $ (20,933,351) |